

REMARKS

Claims 1-27, 31-45, 49, 50, 54-56 and 60-62 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 28-30, 46-48, 51-53 and 57-59 are canceled, without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited therein. No new matter is added.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representatives by Examiner Faber at the interview held on October 18, 2007 are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

I. Amendments to the Drawings

The July 3, 2007 Office Action objected to the amended Fig. 31 attached to the November 6, 2006 Amendment. As agreed during the personal interview, the objection is withdrawn based on the Annotated Marked-up Drawing for Fig. 31 filed with the October 3, 2007 Amendment.

II. §112 Rejections of Claims 27-37 and 46-62

The July 3, 2007 Office Action rejects claims 27-37 and 46-62 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. As agreed during the personal interview, the rejection is withdrawn based on the October 3, 2007 Amendment.

III. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

A. §102(b) Rejection of Claims 1, 3, and 38-41 over Templeman

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3 and 38-41 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,845,303 to Templeman (Templeman). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the personal interview, Templeman does not disclose a layout system " wherein the layout section forms the information storage frames into a plurality of groups, moves the information storage frames belonging to one of the plurality of groups so

as to have an original relative positional relationship," as recited in independent claims 1 and 3 (emphasis added). Further, Templeman does not disclose a layout program that includes "forming the information storage frames into a plurality of groups; and setting to move the information storage frames, which belong to the same group, so as to have a positional relationship with each other, each of the information storage frames holding its shape when being moved," as recited in claim 38, and as similarly recited in claims 39-41 (emphasis added).

Thus, for at least these reasons, independent claims 1, 3 and 38-41 are patentable over Templeman. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

B. §102(b) Rejection of Claim 28-30 over Sams Publishing

The Office Action rejects claims 28-30 over 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over "Sams Teach Yourself Microsoft Publishing 2000 in 10 Minutes," to Sams Publishing. (Sams Publishing). By this Amendment, claims 28-30 are canceled, and thus the rejection of claims 28-30 is moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

C. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 27, 33-37, 56 and 62 over Templeman

The Office Action rejects claims 27, 33-37, 56, and 62 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Templeman. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the personal interview, Templeman does not teach or suggest a "layout section forms the information storage frames into a plurality of groups," as recited in independent claim 27, and as similarly recited in independent claim 34 (emphasis added).

Thus, at least the reasons discussed, claims 27 and 34 are patentable over Templeman. Further, claims 33, 36 and 37, which depend from independent claim 27, and claims 35, 56, and 62, which depend from independent claim 34, are patentable over Templeman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 27 and 34, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

D. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 2, 4, 5-20 and 23-26 over Templeman in further view of Simmons

The Office Action rejects claims 2, 4, 5-20 and 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Templeman in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/003350 to Simmons et al. (Simmons). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the personal interview and discussed above, Templeman does not teach or suggest a "layout section forms the information storage frames into a plurality of groups" as recited in independent claim 5, and as similarly recited in independent claims 12, 20 and 23-26 (emphasis added).

Further, Simmons does not remedy the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Templeman. Simmons is cited by the Office Action for only its alleged teaching a method of solving overlapping.

Thus, for at least these reasons, independent claims 12, 20 and 23-26 are patentable over Templeman and Simmons. Further, claims 2, 4, 6-11 and 13-19 variously depend from independent claims 1, 3, 5 and 12. Thus, claims 2, 4, 6-11 and 13-19 are patentable over Templeman and Simmons for at least the reasons discussed above, with respect to claims 1, 3, 5 and 12, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

E. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 21-22 and 42-45 over Templeman in view of Simmons and in further view of Sams Publishing

The Office Action rejects claims 21-22 and 42-45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Templeman in view of Simmons and in further view of Sams Publishing. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the personal interview, none of the applied references teaches or suggests a "layout section forms the information storage frames into a plurality of groups," as recited in independent claims 5, 12 and 20 (emphasis added). Claims 21-22 and 42-45

variously depend from independent claims 5, 12 and 20. Thus, claims 21-22 and 42-45 are patentable over Templeman, Simmons and Sams Publishing for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 5, 12 and 20, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

F. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 31, 49, 54 and 60 over Sams Publishing in view of Simmons and in further view of Luker

The Office Action rejects claims 31, 49, 54 and 60 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sams Publishing in view of Simmons and in further view of "Microsoft Publisher 2000 Complete User Guide" (Luker). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the personal interview, Sams Publishing and Simmons do not teach or suggest a "layout section forms the information storage frames into a plurality of groups" as recited in independent claim 31 (emphasis added).

Further, Luker does not remedy the deficiencies of Sams Publishing and Simmons. Luker is only cited by the Office Action for its alleged teaching of text having a vertical arrangement.

Thus, for at least these reasons, claim 31 is patentable over Sam's Publishing, Simmons and Luker. Further, claims 49, 54 and 60 depend from independent claims 31. Thus, claims 49, 54 and 60 are patentable over Templeman, Simmons and Sams Publishing for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 31, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

G. §103(a) Rejection of Claim 32 over Sams Publishing

The Office Action rejects claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sams Publishing. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the personal interview, Sams Publishing does not teach or suggest a "layout section forms the information storage frames into a plurality of groups" as recited in

independent claim 32 (emphasis added). As discussed above, Sams Publishing merely discloses a layout with a plurality of frames and a user can manually select frames to form a frame group (Sams Publishing, pg. 25).

For at least the reason discussed, claims 32 is patentable over Sams Publishing.

Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

H. §103(a) Rejection of Claims 46, 48, 50-53, 55, 57-59 and 61 over Sams Publishing in further view of Templeman

The Office Action rejects claims 46, 48, 50-53, 55, 57-59 and 61 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Sams Publishing in further view of Templeman. By this Amendment, claims 46-48, 51-53 and 57-59 are canceled, and thus the rejection of claims 46, 48, 51-53 and 57-59 is moot. The rejection of claims 50 and 55 is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the personal interview, neither Templeman nor Sams Publishing teaches or suggests a "layout section forms the information storage frames into a plurality of groups" as recited in independent claim 32. Claims 50 and 55 depend from independent claim 32. Thus, claims 50 and 55 are patentable over Sams Publishing and Templeman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 32, as well as for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Randi B. Isaacs
Registration No. 56,046

JAO:PQW/jls

Date: November 15, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461